Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 12-14 and 17-19 are pending and rejected in the application. Claims 1, 9 and 17-20 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

On page 3, the Official Action rejects claims 1, 5, 9, 11-13 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komuro (EP0930556) in view of Candelore (US 7,225,164) and further in view of Yip (US 2002/0004901). It is respectfully submitted, however, that the claims are patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth below

Applicant's invention, as recited by claim 1, includes features which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

> **... wherein each transceiver device utilizes, in the common list, other revocation information from other transceiver devices that previously uploaded revocation information to the revocation integrator device to:**
>
> **a) deny unauthorized reproduction devices from reproducing the content when the unauthorized devices are included in the common list, and**
>
> **b) allow authorized reproduction devices to reproduce the content when the authorized reproduction devices are not included in the common list.**

Claim 1 relates to a system where a common revocation list is utilized by a transceiver device (e.g. set top boxes STBs) to deny or allow reproduction devices (e.g. display devices) to reproduce content. For example, as shown in Fig. 1, STBs 102, 105 and 108 may transmit individual revocation information to integrator device 114. Integrator device 114 then integrates the individual revocation information into a common revocation list which is transmitted back to STBs 102, 105 and 108. Thus, for example, STB 102 not only knows its own revocation information, but also knows the revocation information of STBs 105 and 108. Thus, STB 102 is able to revocate any device that is listed in the common revocation list. Support for this feature can be

at least found in Applicant's Fig. 1 and furthermore described on pages 7-14 of Applicant's specification. No new matter has been added.

In Fig. 11, Komuro shows transmitter 110, transceiver 130 and reproduction devices 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6. In general, transmitter 110 transmits a revocation list (via satellite 120) to transceiver 130. Transceiver 130 then utilizes the revocation list to authorize or deny the individual reproduction devices the ability to reproduce the media content (e.g. if DVD player 1 is included in the revocation list, then DVD player 1 cannot reproduce the movie). Thus, Komuro suggests a one-way transmission where the revocation list is sent from the server to the transceiver. Komuro, however, does not suggest that the transceiver is able to send revocation information back to server 110 in order to contribute to a common revocation list.

In Fig. 3, Yip suggests a combined registration authority (RA) that either registers or revokes a certificate of a particular application. When a subscriber is revoked by combined RA 302, application specific CA 204 for each application is then able to revoke the certificate of the subscriber (combined RA 302 is able to separately authorize or revoke the certificates for application 1 and application 2). Yip's combined RA 302, however, does not generate a common revocation list that is then distributed to both applications (i.e., application specific CA 204 in application 1 does not know the revocation status of application specific CA 204 in application 2, because the two applications are independent and unaware of each other).

Candelore is relied upon for packetizing revocation information into a stream. The combination of Komuro, Yip and Candelore, however, does not suggest the features in Applicant's claim 1.

Applicant's claim 1 is different than the art of record, because a common revocation list is utilized by the transceivers to deny or allow the reproduction devices the ability to reproduce the content ("*common list, other revocation information from other transceiver devices that previously uploaded revocation information to the revocation integrator device to: a) deny unauthorized reproduction devices from reproducing the content when the unauthorized devices are included in the common list, and b) allow authorized reproduction devices to reproduce the content when the authorized reproduction devices are not included in the common list*").

As shown in Applicant's Fig. 1, a plurality of reproduction devices (i.e., displays 101, 104 and 107) are connected to a plurality of transceiver devices (i.e., STB 102, 105 and 108). Each of the STBs reads the authentication information from each of the displays (i.e., the STBs 102, 105 and 108 read the authentication information from displays 101, 104 and 107 respectively). If the STB determines that a display is revoked, then the revocation information is sent by the STB to revocation list integrator 114 (i.e., STB 102, 105 and 108 each send their own revocation information to revocation list integrator 114). Integrator 114 then generates a common revocation list (i.e., the common revocation lists include the revocation information from each of the separate STBs 102, 105 and 108). The common list is then transmitted from transmitter 116 back to each of STBs 102, 105 and 108, respectively.

Each of the STBs are then able to either authorize or deny the display to reproduce the content. For example, STB 102 is able to use the revocation information from both STBs 105 and 108 in order to determine whether display 101 should be revoked or not. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Independent claims 9, 17 and 18 include similar features to claim 1. Thus, these claims are also patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

Dependent claims 5, 11-13 and 19 include all of the features of the claims from which they depend. Thus, these claims are also patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

On page 11, the Official Action rejects claims 4 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komura in view of Candelore, in view of Yip and further in view of Ji (US 2004/0054892). Ji is relied upon for suggesting an MPEG transport stream. Ji, however, does not make up for the deficiencies of Komura, Candelore and Yip with respect to independent claim 1. Thus, claims 4 and 12 are also patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

On page 12, the Official Action rejects claims 6 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komura in view of Candelore in view of Yip and further in view of Holden (US 5,692,124). Holden is relied upon for transmitting a revocation when using an IP packet. Holden, however, does not make up for the deficiencies of Komura, Candelore and Yip with respect to the independent claims. Thus, these claims are also patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

On page 13, the Official Action rejects claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komura, Candelore, Yip, Ji and Holden. As previously described, Ji and Holden do not make up for the deficiencies of Komura, Candelore and Yip. Thus, since independent claim 20 includes similar features to claim 1, it is also patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738
Attorney for Applicant

RAE/fp

Dated: January 13, 2011

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

FP_1080877